REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-21 and 23-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-14, 16-21 and 23-25 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. Objection to Claims

Claims 20, 21 and 23-25 were objected to, with the Examiner (1) noting inconsistent terminology used in the dependent claims when referring to the independent claim, and (2) recommending that the word 'recordable' be added to such claims to overcome such rejection. Applicants have amended such claims accordingly, in order to address all of the Examiner's concerns and expeditiously place this case in condition for allowance.

Therefore, the objection to the claims has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended Claim 16 to correct the antecedent basis issue identified by the Examiner.

Therefore, the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 20, 21 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner recommended that the word 'recordable' be added to such claims to overcome such rejection. Applicants have amended such claims accordingly, in order to address all of the Examiner's concerns and expeditiously place this case in condition for allowance.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 20, 21 and 23-25under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Agapiev (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0120714), hereinafter "Agapiev" in further view of Caulfield (U.S.

Patent No. 6,421,943), in further view of Gonzales et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,041), hereinafter "Gonzales". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of Claims 8-9 in order to clarify that the application is not a mere web browser, as alleged by the Examiner in rejecting Claim 9, and to further clarify the role of the access manager in evaluating the entitlement information that is retrieved. As amended, and as depicted in the preferred embodiment in Figure 5B, Claim 1 includes (i) a web server (element 562), (ii) an access manager and rules engine (element 570 and 572), (iii) a dynamic information retrieval service (elements 532 and 580), and (iv) a plurality of entitlement information providers (element 590). With such a configuration, an application receives a request for a service from an entity, and this application requests access decision information which is then used to make informed entity-specific decisions regarding the service requested by the entity. This request for access decision information is serviced by the dynamic information retrieval service that is used to retrieve entitlement information from *a plurality of entitlement information providers*. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a system configuration or usage of requesting entitlement information, from a plurality of entitlement information providers, by an application. In rejecting Claim 8 (whose features are now a part of amended Claim 1), the Examiner equates Agapiev's client 200 (Figure 2) with the claimed application. Applicants urge that, as amended, it is now clear that the claimed 'application' is not equivalent to Agapiev's client since per amended Claim 1 a request for a service is received by the claimed application, and in response the claimed application requests access decision information which is then used to make informed entity-specific decisions regarding the service requested by the entity. Agapiev's client, alleged to be equivalent to the claimed 'application', provides no such functionality. Instead, Agapiev's client merely requests information (Agapiev paragraphs [0050] and [0051]).

Still further, it is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed feature of "wherein the plurality of entitlement information providers are determined *based on the plurality of entitlement information items identified in the request that is received*". While the cited Caulfield reference describes a server that performs a background check on a user requesting to register a firearm, the details of how criminal records are accessed are not described. There is no teaching or suggestion of receiving a request from an application, where (1) this request identifies a plurality of entitlement information items for an entity, and (2) the *plurality of entitlement information providers* are determined based on this request identification. These claimed features advantageously allow usage of a single request from an application providing a service to an entity to trigger multiple entitlement information requests from multiple entitlement providers in parallel.

Thus, it is urged that the amendment made to Claim 1 – which clarifies that there is an intermediary application providing a service for a requesting entity, and it is this intermediary application

that accesses a different service (a dynamic information retrieval service) that obtains entitlement information *from a plurality of entitlement information providers* – has overcome the present rejection of such claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2, 3 and 8-10 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2, 3 and 8-10 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 8 (and similarly for Claim 18), Applicants have amended such claim in accordance with the Specification description at page 21, lines 1-26. It is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggestion the claimed session being started in a separate server to facilitate retrieval of entitlement information from a plurality of clients. It is further urged that Claim 8 (and similarly for Claim 18) is non-obvious for reasons given below with respect to Claim 6 (of which Claim 8 now depends upon).

Further with respect to Claim 9 (and similarly for Claim 25), Applicants have amended such claim in accordance with the Specification description at page 19, line 26 – page 20, line 8. It is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggestion this type of functionality for a rules engine. For example, in rejecting the rules engine features of Claim 9, the Examiner cites Caulfield's teaching at col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 45 since this cited passage describes determining whether the purchaser may operate a fire arm. This fire arm operation determination does not describe any details of how such determination is made, or details as to how data is extracted. Thus, it is further urged that amended Claim 9 (and similarly for Claim 25) is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 11-13, 18-21 and 25 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-13, 18-21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 4, 7, 14, 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Agapiev in further view of Caulfield, in view of Gonzales, in view of Zhu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,928,526), hereinafter "Zhu". This rejection is respectfully traversed for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1, as the newly cited reference to Irie does not overcome the teaching deficiencies identified hereinabove.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 4, 7, 14, 17 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 6, 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Agapiev in view of Caulfield, in view of Gonzales, in further view of Irie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,099), hereinafter "Irie" This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 6, 16 and 23 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1, as the newly cited reference to Irie does not overcome the teaching deficiencies identified hereinabove.

Further with respect to Claim 6, such claim recites "wherein each one of the retrieval clients generates a protocol module to form a plurality of protocol modules, and wherein each one of the protocol modules retrieves entitlement information from a given one of the entitlement information providers that it is associated with using a provider specific protocol that is compatible with the given one of the entitlement information providers". Thus, when Claim 6 is viewed in combination with Claim 1 (as Claim 6 depends upon Claim 1), a retrieval client is generated for each one of the plurality of entitlement information providers, and these generated retrieval clients themselves generate a protocol module. Thus, there is a two-phased approach to achieving the protocol module generation – first there is the generation of a retrieval client, where this generated retrieval client then generates the protocol module, somewhat akin to a grandparent/parent/child process where a grandparent generates a child who later generates their own child. It is urged that none of the cited references teach or suggest such tiered/hierarchical generation of protocol modules.

In rejecting Claim 6, the Examiner states that Agapiev teaches that each one of the retrieval clients generates a protocol module at paragraph 0061. Applicants show that there, Agapiev states:

> "[0061] FIG. 7 illustrates a flowchart of the process involved in a search phase consistent with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. With respect to FIG. 7, the search phase occurs subsequent to the code-generation phase and begins by receiving a request from the client including a designation of sites to be searched 700. The designation of sites to be searched can include any or all of the sites that were included in the code-generation phase. The search agent sends a request to each designated search site on behalf of the client 702. A search is conducted on each of the designated search sites according to the specific methodologies learned during the code-generation phase 704. The results from the search of the designated sites 704 are then parsed 706, and the parsed results are aggregated and presented to the client 708. As an optional step in the search phase, if any errors are detected in searching the designated sites, those errors can be reported to the client, or their presence can alternatively call the inclusion agent to initiate a new instance of the code-generation phase 710."

As can be seen, per this cited passage: (1) a request is received that includes a designation of sites to search, (2) the search agent sends a request to each designated search site, where a search is conducted,

(3) these results are parsed and aggregated, and (4) the aggregated results are presented to the client. This cited passage does not describe any generation step of generating a protocol module.

Importantly, because the site to be searched already had to have been contacted/communicated with in order to generate this customized search agent, there would be no need for this Agapiev search agent to generate a protocol module for accessing the site as such communication has already been established when forming/generating this customized search agent (Agapiev paragraph [0058]-[0059]).

Applicants further show that because Agapiev has already generated a customized search agent that accounts for idiosyncrasies with respect to the sites that are searched (Agapiev paragraph [0058]), there would have been no reason for this customized search agent to itself further generate a protocol module as the customized search agent already accounts for specific implementation details of the sites that are searched (Agapiev [0058]).

Quite simply, per the Agapiev teachings, communication with the remote site must be established *prior to* Agapiev's generation of a customized search agent, and thus there would be no need or reason for Agapiev's customized search agent to itself generate a protocol module. Since this Agapiev customized search agent is being equated to the claimed retrieval client that is generated (per Claim 1), it is urged that Agapiev does not teach, suggest, or otherwise have need for this customized search agent/retrieval client to itself generate a protocol module as the protocol with the site to be searched has already occurred prior to this customized search module being created in the first place. Claim 6 expressly states "each one of the retrieval clients generates a protocol module". Thus, there would have been no reason or motivation to further modify the teachings of Agapiev in accordance with the teachings of Irie (which is cited as teaching generation of a plurality of search agents using different protocols).

In any event, even if this combination were proper (which it is not, as described above), the resulting combination does not teach or otherwise suggest the tiered/hierarchical generation scheme where a generated item (retrieval client) itself generates another item (protocol module) that is used to retrieve information using a specific protocol that is compatible with a given entitlement information provider, as provided by the features of Claim 6 in combination with Claim 1 (of which Claim 6 depends upon). Thus, it is urged that Claim 6 is not obvious in view of the cited references, for all the foregoing reasons.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 6, 16 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

VII. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: June 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants